

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is responsive to the final Office Action mailed June 9, 2009 in the above-identified application.

Claims 2-4, 15 and 24 are the claims currently presented for examination in the present application.

Claim 2 is amended to clarify features recited thereby. These amendments are fully supported by Applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's Statement of the Substance of the Interview

Applicant thanks for the opportunity of a telephone interview conducted on August 21, 2009. Regarding the Applicant's Statement of the Substance of the Interview, Applicant notes as follows.

During the interview, Applicant's representative, George Brieger, Registration No. 52.652, discussed points of distinction of Applicant's invention as claimed in claim 2 over the cited art with reference to Fig. 3 of the Drawings. Clarifying amendments to claim 2 were discussed. The Examiner agreed that the cited art does not disclose or suggest Applicant's invention as claimed in claim 2. Further, the Examiner stated that he will conduct a further search of the prior art and provide any relevant references.

Rejection of Claims 2-4, 15 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-4, 15 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Camenzind, PCT International Publication No. WO 99/56918 in view of Lohmann et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,014,396. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action acknowledges (Office Action, page 2) that Camenzind does not disclose a transmission arrangement configured to pivot about one spindle, as required by claim 2. However, the Office Action alleges that Lohmann discloses or suggests such features.

Lohmann does not disclose or suggest the transmission arrangement that changes the force direction of the load from the first direction, as required by claim 2. Lohmann discloses that translating lever 69 transmits the force of the load in the same direction as extension 72 to extension member 23 and counterforce member 24. *A fortiori*, Lohmann does not disclose or suggest a transmission arrangement that changes a force direction to a torque force rotating about the one spindle, as further required by claim 2. Further, Lohmann does not disclose or suggest a

transmission arrangement that transmits a torque force as the weight of the load directly to the measuring center, as also required by claim 2.

Accordingly, even taken together in combination, Camenzind and Lohmann do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 2.


Claims 3, 4, 15 and 24 depend from claim 2, and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING
SYSTEM ON October 9, 2009

RCF:GB/jl



Robert C. Faber
Registration No.: 24,322
OSTROLENK FABER LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700